

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 21, 2003, claim 6 was objected to; claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 16-19, 21, 22, 24-31, and 34-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,377,982 (Rai); claims 32 and 33 were rejected under § 103 over Rai in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,740,361 (Brown); and claim 20 was rejected under § 103 over Rai in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,347,079 (Stephens).

Claim 6 has been amended to address the objection with respect to improper dependency.

The Office Action cited to the following passages to support its contention that Rai discloses an accounting unit having a first entry to indicate a quality of service: col. 19, lines 49-67; and col. 18, lines 60-62. The cited column 19 passage of Rai discloses end system service configuration for configuring network service for an end system based on a subscriber's service profile. The subscriber's service profile includes information to authenticate the end system's ISP and quality of service (QoS) information. Rai, 19:56-60. The cited column 18 passage of Rai refers to a home registration server accessing the subscriber's directory to learn subscriber service profile information (including quality of service options subscribed to). These passages describe registration and configuration procedures performed by an end system to gain access to the network functions mentioned elsewhere in Rai. However, nowhere within the cited passages in columns 18 and 19 is there any mention whatsoever of any accounting, much less the collection of an accounting unit, that has a *first entry* to indicate a quality of service. The Office Action has failed to cite to any evidence for its contention that Rai discloses an accounting unit having a first entry to indicate a quality of service. In fact, when Rai actually discusses accounting attributes reported in accounting packets by accounting clients to accounting servers in column 29, Rai makes no mention of QoS. The seven accounting attributes listed in column 29 do not relate to QoS.

For this reason alone, Rai does not anticipate claim 1. Furthermore, as a separate, independent basis of allowability of claim 1 over Rai, the Office Action has also failed to establish that Rai discloses an accounting unit having a second entry to indicate mobility management. The Office Action cited to the following passages of Rai as disclosing the recited feature: col. 2, lines 36-40, col. 29, lines 53-65. The cited column 2 passage notes

that mobility management is supported. The cited column 29 passage notes that one of the accounting attributes of the accounting packets disclosed in Rai is an Accounting Multi-Session Id attribute, which is an identifier assigned by the home registration server and communicated to a foreign registration server. This identifier enables accounting records from different IWFs (inter-working functions) to be related together. However the identifier is not an entry of an accounting unit that indicates mobility management.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 is clearly allowable over Rai.

With respect to independent claim 16, Rai fails to disclose a unit of accounting information having an entry indicating a quality of service provided over a packet-based network. With respect to each of independent claims 21 and 31, Rai fails to disclose an accounting unit having an entry indicating a quality of service and a second entry indicating usage of mobility management.

With respect to independent claim 29, Rai fails to disclose an accounting unit that includes an entry to identify an amount of data communicated and another entry identifying mobility management. With respect to claim 29, the Office Action has failed to even mention where in Rai there is any teaching of collecting an accounting unit having an entry identifying the amount of data communicated. Therefore, a proper rejection has not even been established with respect to claim 29.

With respect to independent claim 32, Rai fails to disclose a storage device comprising a data structure having an entry indicating quality of service provided over a packet-based network.

Because Rai fails to disclose elements of each of the independent claims, the dependent claims are also allowable.

Therefore, allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (NRT.0013US).

Respectfully submitted,



Date: July 21, 2003

Dan C. Hu
Reg. No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

